



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/856,188	05/17/2001	Frank Ziemer	514413-3873	4066

20999 7590 10/03/2003

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

CLARDY, S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1616

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2003

//

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/856,188

Applicant(s)

Ziemer et al

Examiner

S. Mark Clardy

Art Unit

1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 4, 2003
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 13-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 5, 10 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1616

Claims 1-11 and new claims 13-21 are pending in this application which has been filed under 35 USC 371 as a national stage application of PCT/EP99/08470, filed November 5, 1999. This application lacks unity of invention under 37 CFR 1.475 (MPEP 1850, 1893.03(d)). Claim 12 has been canceled.

Applicants' claims are drawn to safened herbicidal compositions comprising

- 1) herbicidal benzoic acid derivatives of the formula V-CO-phenyl¹
- 2) safener (see the various structures and named compounds in claim 1).

In the response filed July 16, 2003, applicants elected the species comprising:

- 1) isoxaflutole (herbicide I-1)
- 2) isoxadifen (safener II-9).

The examined species has been expanded to include the triketone herbicides, as well as the elected isoxaflutole. No claims have been held withdrawn from further consideration.

Again, upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Claims 6-11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75© as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim may not depend from another multiply dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

¹V may be 1,2-oxazole, 1,2-diazole, cyclohexenone, or R-CO-C(R)-

Art Unit: 1616

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1, the substituent W4 is incorrect (and thus does not allow for applicants' elected safener); the spiro atom should be carbon, not nitrogen. In claim 3, W is defined as a number from 0 to 6, but in claim 1, it is a chemical structure.

Claims 1-3 and 13-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 135(a) based upon claims 1-12 of Rüegg, US Patent No. 6,489,267. The elected subject matter herein is claimed in Rüegg.

Failure to present claims and/or take necessary steps for interference purposes after notification that interfering subject matter is claimed constitutes a disclaimer of the subject matter. This amounts to a concession that, as a matter of law, the patentee is the first inventor in this country. See *In re Oguie*, 517 F.2d 1382, 186 USPQ 227 (CCPA 1975).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 and 13-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ort et al (US 5,441,922).

Art Unit: 1616


Ort et al teaches the combination of triketone herbicides which are within the scope of applicants' claims (col 1), with the safeners as claimed herein (col 2).

Thus it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined applicants' non-elected triketone herbicides with the disclosed safeners because these components have been taught in Ort et al as useful safened herbicidal compositions.

No unobvious or unexpected results are noted; no claim is allowed.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103c and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Mark Clardy whose telephone number is (703) 308-4550.


S. Mark Clardy
Primary Examiner
AU 1616

September 29, 2003